



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,520	01/27/2004	Alessandro Spaggiari	26218	2209
20529	7590	07/17/2007	EXAMINER	
NATH & ASSOCIATES 112 South West Street Alexandria, VA 22314				EDGAR, RICHARD A
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3745				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/17/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/766,520	SPAGGIARI, ALESSANDRO
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Richard Edgar	3745

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Richard Edgar. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Derek Richmond. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 10 July 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 8.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patents 4,838,760 (Brackett), 4,150,919 (Matucheski) and Japanese Patent Application Laid-open No. 57-24499.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Richmond initiated the interview by a review of the invention and the previous Office action. In said review, the appropriateness of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections pending was questioned. Mr. Richmond respectfully pointed out that FIG. 2 shows a solid casing and is thus in support of the previous amendment to the claims. Examiner Edgar, respectfully pointed out that while the cross-section of FIG. 2 does in fact show a solid casing at that specific cross-section, there is no discussion of that specific cross-section being identical in the annular direction which would seemingly form the solid casing; therefore it is the examiner's opinion that applying the specific cross-section of FIG. 2 around the entire circumference or annular direction, was not possessed by Applicant at the time the application was filed.

The examiner was under the opinion that if a continuation-in-part application was filed incorporating similar claims, but supported by the specification, the combination of applied references listed above, would teach away from the claimed invention since the U.S. reference to Brackett teaches openings 14 through the motor (col. 2, lines 9-14). Matucheski teaches drives other than viscous drives, which are used with a radiator, to be cooled by a cooling flow over a portion of the drive surface (see col. 2, lines 32-36); but the apertures 40 are not taught as being positioned in the specifically claimed location. Similarly, the Japanese reference cited above shows the cooling holes 4 in the front face of the hub 2, and not in the specifically claimed location. Though the differences are seemingly small, there does not appear to be sufficient motivation for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the Matucheski or Japanese reference listed above, by Brackett since relocating the apertures to the claimed location would not provide a readily recognized advantage without the aid of Applicant's disclosure which enables a liquid to be evacuated from the hub .